

~~TOP SECRET~~

SECURITY INFORMATION

C-1 NO.

20 December 1951

SUBJECT: Detailed Comments on Collection Paper

O/SO Section

Page 6, paragraph 2: The IPC was approved by the IAC at the end of July. Shouldn't we use this fact rather than saying "the IPC was organized in October?"

paragraph 6: DCI did not instruct IAC, surely. I wonder if the term "current intelligence" in this and the preceding paragraph is not misleading?

Page 10, paragraph 4: Haven't some [] operations been called off? 50X1

Page 15: Shouldn't we either explain or not mention the fact that 40% of the 5,000 reports received yearly [] are not disseminated? 50X1

Page 16, paragraph 2: Whose [] is this? 50X1

paragraph 5: Shouldn't we omit the fact that 50% of these reports merely served to give SO the political picture? Does this mean that they were virtually useless? If not, shouldn't they have been distributed to the State Department?

Page 17, paragraph 1: Does this mean that [] Or is this a typing omission? 50X1
50X1

O/O Section

Page 18, paragraph 1: Awkward writing.

Page 21, paragraph 1: The percentages of coverage are unclear: is the "17%" of the total 17,000 items (which is probably intended) or, as stated, of "the rest" (i.e., of 50% of 17,000)?

Page 22, paragraph 2: The trained manpower problem is common to a number of offices and might be pulled out of this report. The question

Reports - Annual Report

~~TOP SECRET~~

TOP SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION

of providing technically competent collectors, [redacted] might be more fully developed together with a possible answer to it.

Page 23, paragraph 2: Shouldn't we explain why [redacted] has only handled [redacted] cases to date? To one thinking of the large numbers of refugees from the Iron Curtain this figure is minute.

Page 25, paragraph 2: The "promising results" of the [redacted] and the [redacted] surveys should not be too glowingly sold. I have the impression that the net value of these surveys from an intelligence point of view was quite low.

paragraph 2: This paragraph is hard to understand and the figures which are cited are not very convincing. There appear to be four categories of value (of which the first two are lumped together apparently to make the results more impressive): "of considerable value," "of value," "of little value," "of no value." If selection, as proposed in the paragraph, is selection of subject matter to be treated intensively, this is likely to be dangerous. Selection of contacts, however, might be both valid and valuable.

paragraph 3: This problem of source protection and utilization of information probably deserves more expanded treatment; what about use in connection with law enforcement, etc.?

Page 33, paragraph 4: According to statistics, current intelligence derived from the foreign press (delayed three weeks or more) is relatively unimportant. This paragraph also takes centralization of translating facilities and the allocation problem a little too much for granted.

Page 34, paragraph 1: The "efficiency" of FDD exploitation is widely questioned. The discussion of FDD's NSCID probably should not sound quite as discouraged. I would check the status of the proposed NSCID before accepting the last sentence in this paragraph.

paragraph 2: Don't they mean other IAC agencies? What has the Training Office to do with requirements on FDD?

TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET
SECURITY INFORMATION

Page 35, paragraph 1: Some (perhaps most) users don't like the FDD collation approach.

Page 36, line 3: There is a certain peevishness involved in "due priority."

paragraph 2: Omit.

paragraph 3: ☐ is not "contemplated" but actual.

50X1

With respect to FDD wouldn't it be helpful to separate out the several different problems involved:

- a. Indexing;
- b. Procurement of foreign publications;
- c. Exploitation;
- d. Translation.

It would probably be helpful if captions were liberally employed throughout the paper.

TOP SECRET